Study N-306 January 31, 2001

## First Supplement to Memorandum 2001-16

## **Administrative Rulemaking Cleanup (Additional Comment)**

We have received a letter from David Carroll, general counsel to the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, commenting on memorandum 2001-16 (the letter is attached). He agrees with the Department of Industrial Relations and the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board ("DIR & OSHSB") that there is a problem with Government Code Section 11346.2(b)(3), which requires rulemaking agencies to describe alternatives to a proposed regulation. The provision in question is set out in the main memorandum at page 2.

Mr. Carroll suggests that "the first sentence of (3)(A) and the first sentence of (B) may be simply redundant. If there is a duty under the first sentence of (A) to search out reasonable alternatives, then an agency will have 'identified' such alternatives within the meaning of (B)." This is mostly correct. However, there is an important distinction between (A) and (B). Subparagraph (B) is concerned with a special class of reasonable alternatives — "those that would lessen any adverse impact on small business." Requiring a description of alternatives beneficial to small businesses means that an agency must focus particular attention on the needs of small businesses, which the agency might not do if it were only required to describe reasonable alternatives generally. This seems to be a plausible justification for preserving the requirements of both (A) and (B). The fact that Mr. Carroll and DIR & OSHSB have different views as to how Section 11346.2(b)(3) should be reformed affirms the staff's sense that this issue involves more than mere technical cleanup. The staff recommends that Mr. Carroll's perspective be noted and considered when the Commission next considers substantive matters relating to administrative rulemaking.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Hebert Staff Counsel

## LAW OFFICES OF CARROLL & SCULLY, INC.

## 300 MONTGOMERY STREET SUITE 735 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104-1909

CHARLES P. SCULLY (1915-1985)
DONALD C. CARROLL
CHARLES P. SCULLY, II

TELEPHONE 362-0241 AREA CODE 415

January 25, 2001

Law Revision Commission RECEIVED

JAN 2 6 2001

HIe:	
1110.	

Mr. Brian Hebert Staff Counsel California Law Revision Commission 4000 Middlefield Rd., Room D-1 Palo Alto, CA 94303

RF:

Memorandum 2001-16 - Administration Rulemaking

Cleanup (Tentative Recommendation) #N-306

Dear Mr. Hebert:

We serve as General Counsel to the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO.

We share the concern expressed by DIR and the Standards Board with respect to Government Code Section 11346.2(b)(3). With the recent changes, we think that the first sentence of (3)(A) and the first sentence of (B) may be simply redundant. If there is a duty under the first sentence of (A) to search out reasonable alternatives, then, an agency will have "identified" such alternatives within the meaning of (B). Why the last sentence of (B) would apply only to (B) and not to (A) appears to be a legitimate question. We thus agree with the observation of Staff in the first full paragraph of page 3 of the Memorandum 2001-16.

It may be that these legislative changes were intended to lighten the regulatory



Mr. Brian Hebert January 25, 2001 Page 2

> burden on small business; but, the changes should not be such as to present unreasonable and artificial hurdles to the regulatory process.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF

CARROLL & SCULLY, INC.

DCC:lml ope-3-afl-cio

cc:

Art Pulaski

Tom Rankin Heidi Gotlieb

Carol Belcher